

FIFTEEN YEAR REVIEW 2001

INSTITUTE FOR SOCIAL, BEHAVIORAL, AND ECONOMIC RESEARCH (ISBER) THE UNIVERSITY OF CALIFORNIA, SANTA BARBARA

External Review Committee Report

Committee Members:

Kenneth A. Bollen (Chair)
Director, Odum Institute for Research in Social Science,
University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill

James Cramer
Professor of Sociology,
University of California, Davis

Felice J. Levine
Executive Director,
American Sociological Association

ABSTRACT

ISBER is at an important crossroad. It has obtained excellence in its service in the preparation and administration of sponsored research and training. Having attained that goal, ISBER needs to determine its next stage of development. One choice for ISBER is to continue to concentrate on its well-executed role of grant development and administration. An alternative is to combine this grant development and administrative role with new initiatives to promote social science research on the UCSB campus. Suggestions for the expanded role of ISBER include the development and teaching of short interdisciplinary methodological and grant writing workshops, the creation and support of interdisciplinary faculty working groups, and the construction and maintenance of a social science calendar that keeps track of social science talks and activities on the UCSB campus. Regardless of the path it chooses, ISBER faces several obstacles. Given its rapid expansion in the number and amount of grants that it is administering, ISBER will require greater space, personnel, and financial support just to maintain the status quo. An expanded role would require even more resources. Finally, we found that the discussion of administratively moving ISBER under the College to be a distraction to ISBER. There is considerable opposition to moving ISBER and our assessment is that ISBER is best served by maintaining its current administrative home. The threat to relocate ISBER administratively should be removed so that ISBER's energies can be redirected in more useful directions.

INTRODUCTION

The three members of the external review committee were asked to come to ISBER for a 2-day site visit on March 12 and 13, 2001 to evaluate ISBER for its 15 year review. Appendix A contains the schedule that indicates those ISBER members with whom we met. In addition to these personal interviews, we received a notebook of information on ISBER that included the ISBER 15 Year Review Self-Assessment. The interviews and this background information are the primary sources of information on which we base our report.

The bulk of our report consists of responses to the 12 questions that make up the assigned charge to the review committee. The abstract that precedes this Introduction gives key points of the assessment. Recommendations are included with the responses to questions. In particular, responses to questions 6, 9, 10, and 12 provide recommendations and illustrative suggestions for ISBER taking on an expanded role and establishing itself as a visible interdisciplinary institute in the social and behavioral sciences.

CHARGE QUESTIONS POSED TO COMMITTEE

- 1. Based on its self-study, your experiences during your visit, and comparisons with similar centers at other universities, is ISBER meeting its objectives of promoting and servicing a broad range of interdisciplinary research?**

In addressing this question, we would like to distinguish between servicing interdisciplinary research and promoting it. Consider ISBER's service function first. Throughout all our interviews with faculty, researchers, graduate students, and staff, all praised the fellowship and grant services that they obtained through ISBER. On more than one occasion, a faculty member told us that it would not be possible to obtain or to operate a grant that they held without the assistance that ISBER provides. We have no doubt that the grant and fellowship servicing provided by ISBER is an invaluable service to social and behavioral scientists at UCSB. The grants ranged from small, individual researcher based efforts to larger, team led grants that cut across several disciplines. Regardless of size of grant or disciplinary origin, ISBER was consistently praised for its grant administration ability.

The second objective listed is that of promoting interdisciplinary research. Our evaluation of this ISBER objective is a little less clear. Richard Appelbaum and Barbara Harthorn described some earlier efforts that they made to develop

interdisciplinary research projects on particular topics among social scientists at UCSB. They held numerous meetings that were well attended, but in the end no faculty stepped up to lead grant-writing efforts to support research in these areas. This experience discouraged them from attempting to create a research agenda to be followed by faculty. It has been their experience that ISBER is most successful in facilitating research that is initiated from interested faculty. So ISBER's policy has been more of a "bottom-up" rather than a "top-down" approach to generating new research projects.

Indirectly, ISBER has encouraged interdisciplinary research through its reputation as a place that takes much of the pain out of submitting and administering a grant. Our impression is that there are grants that would not have been submitted if the researchers were not able to depend on ISBER to help them in administering it. In our opinion, ISBER's decision to take a more "reactive" stance to proposal initiatives is understandable and mostly a wise decision. However, we believe that there might be some other steps that it could take to facilitate more social scientists to submit interdisciplinary proposals. In our response to questions 6, 9, 10, and 12 we describe some of these activities.

2. Is the overall research productivity of ISBER of a high standard, as measured by the importance and number of its scientific contributions, publications, grants and contracts, and scholarly interchanges (e.g., conferences, workshops, reading groups, etc.)?

ISBER's overall research productivity is impressive. The growth in the number of grants from 68 to 123 from 1992-93 to 1999-00 and the growth in the total dollar value of their grant awards from about \$5.2 million to \$9.4 million are striking. The number of ISBER centers has paralleled these trends with about 14 now under it. The centers are the core of the intellectual exchanges and research with which ISBER is associated. As such most of the scholarly exchanges (conferences, reading groups, etc.) occur within the context of the centers and are not ISBER functions per se. However in our meetings with those directors and others associated with centers we had the impression that the centers differ in their levels of activities. The material that we saw on the Center for Global Studies listed a number of speakers and activities that it hosted. The Health Data Research Facility has formed many ties with the health care system in the state of California and elsewhere. The Center for Spatially Integrated Social Sciences is conducting several workshops around the nation and is contracting for spatial analysis software that will be widely available to researchers throughout the disciplines. Since our charge was not to evaluate ISBER centers but rather to evaluate ISBER, we did not have an exhaustive report on each

center but we did see enough to learn that some of the centers are quite active and visible.

With regard to publications, we examined the annual reports of publications by PIs listed in the ISBER self-report. Our impression is that there are a fair number of publications generated by the ISBER affiliated faculty. However, many of the publications were in edited books or in journals that do not have high visibility. Our impression is that the ISBER faculty should be encouraged to attempt to publish their research in journals with greater visibility. For better or worse, it is these journals that tend to reach the largest audience and that tend to be the most influential source of ideas in a field. We qualify our comments by acknowledging that our backgrounds are insufficiently diverse to evaluate the high impact journals or edited books across the numerous disciplines that participate in ISBER. A useful exercise for ISBER might be to conduct a citation count of the PIs who are running grants through ISBER and to compare this count to a social science department of roughly the same size and that has a reputation of being a very good social science department. This citation comparison would give a crude gauge of relative impact in the published literature compared to a similar sized social science department. What would be missed by this comparison are some of the ISBER-tied projects that receive coverage in more popular media such as newspapers or television. Our impression is that several ISBER projects (e.g., the television violence project, MesoAmerican Research Center, Center for Evolutionary Psychology) have received considerable coverage in the more popular media.

In trying to address this question, the issue is raised of whether we can speak of the scientific contributions of ISBER independent of its centers. That is, the current arrangement of ISBER makes it an incredibly efficient administrator of grants. Its scientific contributions depend solely on the work of its centers and on the individual investigators that it supports in their grants.

3. Are ISBER's current space and budget adequate to support its present mission? In what respects, if any, is ISBER over-extended? In what respects could it be doing more?

Our understanding is that ISBER's current space is about 8,200 square feet and its annual operating funds are about \$250,000 (see ISBER Self-assessment). Our impression from the interviews that we had is that both figures are inadequate for ISBER's functioning. With respect to space, we were told that some projects that run their grants through ISBER did not even consider locating there because of the lack of space. For instance, the Center for Spatially Integrated Social Sciences could not fit in ISBER even though we believe that advantages would flow from having it in the

same building. The approximately 11,000 square feet planned for ISBER in the new social science building will improve the situation, but in our interview with Barbara Harthorn, she stated that 11,000 square feet would just about meet current needs but would fall short of their needs even a few years from now. The shortage of space is of concern since it discourages all of the ISBER projects from locating in the same space and taking advantage of the greater communication and collaborations that can evolve from contingent locations. We encourage the UCSB administration to do all that it can to locate more space for ISBER in its future home in the social science building.

Our impression is that the current ISBER budget falls short of its needs and what is budgeted has too large of a temporary component. The length of our visit and the information made available do not provide us with the expertise to give a formal and detailed evaluation of the budget. However, based on the information that we have, we believe that the budget requests in the ISBER Self-Assessment are reasonable and perhaps even modest. These include a permanent 100% FTE budget line for the Financial Assistant position, a 50% funding for a webmaster position, a permanent budget line for capital equipment needs, a 50% FTE budget line for the Research Development Assistant, and moving the Director of Social Science Research Development position into ISBER and having it funded at 85% or more.

These items are limited to what is needed to continue ISBER's current grant development and administration activities. An expanded role would require additional funding that would depend on which new activities are added to ISBER.

ISBER is overextended in that its growth in personnel and resources has not kept pace with the growth in the number of grants submitted and received. One time-consuming aspect of ISBER's responsibility for grant administration is that there are a fair number of modestly sized grants run through ISBER. Often these smaller grants take as much administrative time as much larger ones. Another way in which ISBER might be overextended is that it seems to be administering a number of grants from the humanities. Part of this is due to the great reputation that ISBER has in administering grants. However given that there is a separate unit on campus to help the research and teaching mission of the humanities, it might make sense to redirect such grants to this entity.

Proposals for additional activities for ISBER are discussed in the responses to questions 6, 9, 10, and 12.

4. What is your assessment of the leadership of ISBER's Director, based on what you have learned during this review and any other sources of information?

All clients of ISBER to whom we spoke have praised Richard Appelbaum's leadership. This degree of consensus is highly unusual and is a testimonial to the fine job of ISBER and its staff. Our only criticism is that ISBER's leadership has not given enough thought to the new directions that the organization could take beyond grant administration. We were struck by the silence that greeted our questions about new visions for ISBER when we asked about this at the ISBER Advisory Committee meeting and in discussion with other ISBER staff. We feel that part of this silence is due to the fact that ISBER has been so dedicated to creating excellent services and so preoccupied with the talk of moving into the College that ISBER leadership and advisors have not had sufficient time to think about the future.

5. Please evaluate the administrative structure of ISBER, its reporting structure, and its efficacy. Do any organizational problems require attention?

The location of ISBER in the administrative structure of UCSB is a concern to many of the people with whom we spoke. The question of whether ISBER should be located in an academic division or an administrative office, and whether it should report to the Dean of Social Sciences or to the Vice Chancellor for Research, was a common preoccupation that dominated many of our discussions. Our view is that this is an unnecessary distraction that is interfering with ISBER's functioning, and that this issue should be settled quickly and forgotten.

ISBER clearly serves large numbers of social scientists engaged in research, so inevitably it will be of interest to and require support from both the Dean of Social Sciences and the Vice Chancellor for Research, regardless of its location and reporting structure. ISBER's future health and vitality depend on the good will and cooperation of both administrators, regardless of ISBER's location. Thus its current location is not the cause of the issue, nor is relocation necessarily a solution.

Our conclusion is that the current arrangement, with ISBER located within the Office of Research, is working well and should be continued. Because social science research is conducted in all colleges and schools on campus, not just by faculty in the Division of Social Sciences, the campus-wide scope of the Office of Research is

appropriate for ISBER. Being located in the Office of Research reaffirms ISBER's primary identity as a research institute, not simply a collectivity of social scientists.

In part, the controversy over location arises from an overly rigid view of bureaucratic separation of functions. One of the principal arguments given in favor of relocating ISBER to the Division of Social Sciences was that ISBER must increasingly be involved in instructional activities, and that these activities are inappropriate for a research unit. Graduate education and research cannot so easily be separated. We find it difficult to imagine a research institute functioning efficiently without being engaged in some types of instructional activities, at least occasionally. (By the same token, instructional units at UCSB must also be engaged in research.) Furthermore, with administrative good will and cooperation, certain facilities can be shared by research and instructional units to the advantage of each; this should be possible, for example, with the CATI lab being developed for the Center for Survey Research, as long as all concerned are flexible and cooperative.

6. Please evaluate ISBER's plans for the future. Should anything more or different be done to enhance the social science research opportunities created by its personnel, facilities, location, and resources?

From all accounts, ISBER has grown substantially in recent years and has largely achieved its longstanding goal of encouraging and facilitating extramural funding for research. The question for the future, then, is whether ISBER should simply continue performing this function, or should it develop new goals and aspirations. We posed this question in all of our conversations and were struck by how universally absent was any vision of new or alternative goals. All groups and individuals with whom we spoke were effusive in praise of ISBER's performance of its traditional functions, and their almost-exclusive concern for the future was that ISBER continue its high level of service as it is doing now.

We state this as an observation, not a criticism. ISBER is enormously successful at generating and incubating research activity, and at facilitating fundraising and administering grants. These are extremely important services which must be continued; any additional innovations must be designed carefully so as not to interfere with this basic function of ISBER. It is such an important function that perhaps it is sufficient; ISBER will still be very successful if its future is merely a continuation of the present.

Many social science research institutes elsewhere, however, perform other services and activities, and ISBER may well wish to consider expanding its role on campus. With diligent probing from us, a number of useful ideas were suggested.

- Expand and make more flexible the incubator role. Currently ISBER seems to work with only two types of entities, individual researchers or formally recognized centers. ISBER should contemplate establishing and facilitating an intermediate level of organization, which might be termed faculty work groups or research programs. This would entail providing modest sums of money (e.g. \$1500) as “seed grants” to interdisciplinary groups of researchers to develop ideas for collaborative research. These groups would be expected to produce research proposals in the short run; in the long run they might disband as readily as they formed, or they might evolve into centers.
- Permanently continue and, if possible, expand the new “seed grant” programs. These programs are widely regarded as successful and serving a useful purpose.
- Establish a greater visibility on campus by promoting colloquia and speakers series. Such programs not only bring visibility to ISBER, but also help foment intellectual excitement and interdisciplinary communication. If such programs already are plentiful on campus, ISBER could help upgrade them by co-sponsorship of eminent speakers or by helping to publicize them more extensively. ISBER could provide a valuable resource to social scientists at the UCSB campus simply by creating and maintaining a social science calendar of events. This could consolidate information on campus events so that faculty, students, and staff would need only check a single source for information.
- Sponsor workshops to upgrade research skills among both faculty and graduate students. Departments and academic programs provide in-depth courses on research methods, but many researchers may instead desire short overviews or updates on topics or introductions to new software etc. At least at the outset, we envision 2-hour workshops to 8-hour short mini-courses (not for credit) outlining the basic features of research techniques or software, both for quantitative and qualitative styles of research. These would be offered voluntarily by faculty, staff, or even advanced graduate students, with both faculty and graduate students as the clientele.
- Provide funding and proposal development workshops for graduate students. Graduate students seem to be an overlooked part of the research community. Many graduate students would benefit from workshops on funding sources and how to write proposals; their benefits would be both short-run, in terms of their own dissertation research needs, and long-run in terms of professional development as future faculty.

- Build training opportunities within ISBER-supported projects at the undergraduate, graduate, and/or postdoctoral levels. Consider the possibility of research training grants as linked to ISBER's core interdisciplinary projects and strengths. These issues are addressed further in the responses to questions 9 and 10.
- Establish a mechanism for disseminating or providing access to audio and visual data sources. The Inter-university Consortium for Political & Social Research (ICPSR) at the University of Michigan does an excellent job of disseminating numerical data files (e.g. General Social Survey, other survey data, census data, etc.), but no comparable service is available for other types of data sources. Several ISBER centers have assembled impressive audio or visual data archives that potentially have great value to other researchers if they could be made publicly accessible. It is not immediately clear how to do this; perhaps this is an excellent topic for innovative research at ISBER. If the technical problems could be solved, then ISBER could achieve national visibility and prominence by serving as an audio/visual data archive and clearinghouse.

The Odum Institute for Research in Social Science at the University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill has a similar mission to that of ISBER. Its web site (www.odum.unc.edu) can be checked for further information and examples on how some of these ideas are implemented there. Furthermore we recommend that the web sites of other social science institutes on other campuses be checked for additional ideas of new activities for ISBER.

7. ISBER interfaces with many academic departments at UCSB and this interface affects supervision of graduate students and post-docs, shared research facilities and staff, etc. Based both on your experience elsewhere and what you have learned in this review, can you recommend ways to improve these relationships at UCSB? What is the contribution of ISBER to the graduate programs of these departments? Does ISBER impact the experience of undergraduates?

To the extent to which funded research projects employ student RA's, ISBER does contribute to graduate and undergraduate education at UCSB. For those students employed by ISBER, this contribution is substantial. Relative to the overall numbers of graduate and undergraduate students at UCSB, ISBER's contributions are modest. Graduate students indicated that most graduate students

have never heard of ISBER, and department chairs suggested that most graduate students depend on other sources of support (mainly TA positions).

We have indicated above several ways in which ISBER could increase its contribution to graduate education. Graduate students expressed strong enthusiasm for such ideas as workshops on grantsmanship, methodology and software workshops, and expanded support for and publicity of colloquia. Also, there are opportunities for ISBER to assume a role in research training, as discussed subsequently.

8. Please review ISBER's professional research personnel. Are they of high standard (e.g. similar in research stature to research personnel in your own institution or to faculty of similar rank in research universities)? Does the appointment and advancement process for research personnel in ISBER seem fair and rigorous?

We met with two professional researchers, Anabel Ford and Ron Williams, and reviewed vitae of the others. Ford and Williams are actively engaged in large and impressive research projects, and they compare favorably with similar personnel in our institutions. We lacked time to discuss her research program with Barbara Harthorn, but her vita seems respectable and we heard favorable accounts from several of her collaborators. Many of the other professional researchers seem to be marginally involved in ISBER and seem to have been located here for reasons of convenience (e.g. spouses of faculty). Our understanding is that these researchers are self-supporting except in that ISBER contributes space to some of them for their projects. Except for the possible cost of space, the professional research personnel seem to entail little cost.

9. How does ISBER compare with other top Social Science research institutes in the nation? Please assess in relation to the resources available to ISBER.

As noted above, the Institute for Social, Behavioral, and Economic, Research (ISBER) has functioned extraordinarily effectively as the campus Organized Research Unit (ORU) for sponsored research in the social sciences. It takes seriously this role and, through its efforts, has promoted interdisciplinary work within the social and behavioral sciences, across fields of science, and between science (including the social and behavioral sciences) and the humanities. Thus far, its primary mandated activity has been directed to assisting investigators in the proposal development process and in the technical and administrative aspects of grant application and

management. Also, ISBER has been an incubator or “home” for some 14 centers where ISBER similarly provides essential administrative expertise and support. In addition, ISBER’s commitment to high quality service is reflected in its giving selflessly to help others—from graduate students and faculty to other ORUs less savvy in extramural funding processes. On these grounds, ISBER far exceeds the norm of similar organizational entities performing the same or similar service functions—especially in light of its limited staff size and resource base.

ISBER excels in what it is and has been supported to be, and thus we do not believe that it should be faulted at this stage for what it is not. Most other social science research institutes at academic institutions or academically oriented sites have resources, staff, and organizational support to perform functions other than or in addition to high quality grant support and administration. Most such institutes with national reputations and greater visibility on their own campuses do not uniformly provide the polished service that is the great achievement of ISBER, but most with national reputations have taken on a more active and proactive role in operating as centers of research activity and exchange. For example, the Institute for Social Research at the University of Michigan, the National Opinion Research Center at the University of Chicago, or even a freestanding research institute like the Brookings Institution have the ambition coupled with the necessary resources and staff to create a community of interdisciplinary exchange, develop infrastructure that can advance the social sciences, and offer a broader band of training for students and for scholars.

With appropriate support and aspiration from the UC leadership, we believe ISBER could become a more fully operational interdisciplinary research institute in the social and behavioral sciences. ISBER has the talent pool and the firm administrative base to develop in such a direction. There is also strong social and behavioral science capacity across departments at UCSB to make this happen. Furthermore, as the social and behavioral sciences are growing in national visibility, importance, and support, it could be of great benefit to this campus to embrace such an ambition. A social and behavioral science institute for interdisciplinary research and research training would be a great addition to the west coast and to the UC system. Parts of it should be quite fundable with potential federal support. But, beyond a strategic plan for appropriate and staged development, there needs to be an investment in the vision and a visible package of additional resources.

We see that ISBER and UC Santa Barbara are at an important juncture, and we urge that intentional planning and appropriate support be undertaken to develop ISBER into a first-class research institute in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences. As noted previously, ISBER’s posture has been reactive where it has earned a very positive reputation on campus, especially through informal channels and referrals from satisfied “clients”—whether they be affiliated faculty, centers, or other

institutes. Were ISBER to become a more lively center for stimulating new cross-cutting work, supporting interdisciplinary working groups, providing a venue for feedback on work being planned or in progress, or offering a package of formal and informal research training, its visibility would be enhanced and its role enlarged on campus and in the external academic and scientific community. It currently enjoys visibility and praise among those it ably serves, but it is less visible on campus otherwise. Outside of UC Santa Barbara, ISBER does not seem to be known as an institute. Were it to develop a broader role and purpose, it could contribute to the infrastructure of the social and behavioral sciences and also serve as a magnet to bring people to UCSB who understand and appreciate the benefits of such an entity.

10. Can you suggest ways to take greater advantage of, or to leverage better, ISBER resources (e.g., different allocation of staff FTE to tasks; better use of funds or built space; more creative use of space; new alliances; different approach to fund raising or public service, etc)?

As it is currently operating, ISBER seems to be using its resources strategically and adroitly. ISBER and its core staff get uniformly high praise for doing a lot with a little and making very modest dollars stretch to get the necessary jobs both done and done “on time.” Short of additional venture capital and a commitment of resources from across the University to support and promote the growth of this institute (which is strongly recommended), ISBER seems to be doing as well as it can at leveraging resources with as much as it has. The absence of enhanced resources for ISBER in direct support or in a larger indirect cost allocation is indeed a serious problem. While doing more with less is admirable, in the long haul it may not be sustainable, even for the fine work it does, because it limits innovation and is highly dependent on the dedication of individuals who routinely go well beyond the “call.”

There may be different approaches to fundraising that could help with building an essential reservoir of support. Dedicated time and consultation from a development expert could help identify strategies that are compatible with UCSB’s broader development goals. Of course, it would be advantageous if ISBER could be included as a target of opportunity in any overall university plan. Short of that, it might be valuable to identify approaches that could yield core funds for ISBER. For example, perhaps center directors could join with the ISBER director to approach private foundations engaged in funding major projects and centers. The support requests for the centers themselves could include allocations for some core functions at ISBER that add to the value and productivity of the centers. The centers (and major projects) combined demonstrate that, under the ISBER umbrella, there is important interdisciplinary research on cutting edge issues with practical applications. ISBER could rightly be depicted as the DNA to make such innovations happen. While this

strategy would require a commitment to working on behalf of ISBER from high profile center directors and investigators (who have benefited), the presence of such funds would enrich all entities and the future of social and behavioral science innovations at UC Santa Barbara.

Another strategy is to develop a more intentional research program with the professional research personnel. Several current members of the professional staff, for example, have interests in health and well being that might lead the development of some major research proposals and training grants for ISBER (e.g., from NIH). Such a model would likely require a shift in how the University conceives of at least some of its core group of professional staff and the types of support provided to them. It might also require a shift in how staffing is done. The plus of this shift, however, could be significant in attracting major sources of support, providing research and contractual services, and creating a cadre of researchers who could add to the pace of productivity as well as train students and research teams. Therefore, the university should give strong consideration to the development of a core research staff dedicated to ISBER work and to the development of new sources of extramural support.

11. Has ISBER made a persuasive rationale for continuation at UCSB as an ORU?

The ISBER 15 Year Review Self-Assessment and Proposal for Continued ORU Existence (March 2001), coupled with prior reviews and review committee reports from years 5 and 10, make an exceedingly strong case for the value—and increasing value—of ISBER as an Organized Research Unit at UCSB. These materials alone, and what they reveal about the volume and quality of ISBER work under its current operations, more than commend the continuation of ISBER. From every perspective probed during the intensive 2-day site visit, our External Review Committee only gained in knowledge regarding the essential services that ISBER provides in bringing externally funded research projects to the fore and administering them commendably. Problems cited in prior reviews in years 5 and 10 have been effectively addressed over the last review period. Under the able and dedicated leadership of Richard Applebaum and a committed staff, ISBER is more than meeting expectations to justify its continuation as an ORU.

Our Review Committee was impressed with the effectiveness with which ISBER worked with faculty researchers at all stages of the careers ladder and with projects large and small on the preparation of extramural research proposals and on the administration of these grants. Also, the high degree of substantive support provided to centers and even to other ORUs in executing these functions is commendable. We concluded based on the written reports and related documents, direct and indirect

questions during our interviews, and direct and indirect sources of data that ISBER is doing a fine job in the context of its mission as it has been defined, and it should be continued with enhanced infrastructural support to achieve these important goals.

As a Review Committee, we suggest not only that ISBER should be continued but also that UCSB should give considerable thought to moving a step beyond during the next period of operations. We felt so reassured about the quality of the basic functions performed by ISBER that we think that, with appropriate planning, resources, institutional commitment, and leadership, ISBER could build on its very effective base to become a vital interdisciplinary research institute at UCSB. We believe that the campus would benefit from an expanded role and vision for ISBER. Absent the decision to move to a new stage in ISBER's development, however, we still conclude that ISBER is very effective in its own terms and, without doubt, should be continued.

12. Do you have any other thoughts or suggestions for ways in which ISBER might enhance social science research at UCSB?

In this report, we have sought to set forth an ambition for ISBER of taking on a new role in promoting social science research at UCSB. This report includes a number of initiatives that could be important components of such a strategy. In response to question 6 and elsewhere in this report, we presented a number of possibilities for ISBER that could enhance social science research and forge new interdisciplinary connections at UCSB. The specifics mentioned in this report emerged from discussions during our site visit. From that vantage alone, it is clear that faculty members, department chairs, deans, graduate students, and others could see the value of a more proactive ISBER at UCSB (despite their palpable concerns that, were resources to remain modest, the first priority needs to be put on maintaining the vital functions that ISBER performs).

Our visit and this report can only constitute the beginnings of a discussion regarding the benefits to UCSB—to the campus, to the state, and to its national presence—of building ISBER into a social science research institute of visibility and substance. We were persuaded that, for a university as strong as UCSB is and could be in the social, behavioral, and economic sciences, such an institute could be a significant component. We recommend that concrete steps be taken with the involvement of ISBER's advisory committee to examine the potential and feasibility of ISBER moving to a next stage of development. It might be useful to hold a retreat or charge a task force with specifically addressing this issue and what would be needed by way of support (both financial and human). Any further planning activity should be done with some dispatch. It would be useful, however, to develop a plan to support a

transformed ISBER. Such a document could address strategies to (1) enhance research and synergistic activity, (2) promote research training for predoctoral and postdoctoral students as well as undergraduates, and (3) build infrastructure (e.g., data resources from major UCSB projects) that could add to the research productivity of social and behavioral scientists—both on campus and potentially beyond.

APPENDIX

3/13/00 noon

Agenda Outline for UCSB Institute for Social, Behavioral, and Economic Research External Review

Sunday Evening, March 11, 2001

7:00 PM Dinner at the Harbor Restaurant, Committee, France Córdova and Rich Appelbaum Group to meet at lobby of Villa Rosa Inn.

Monday, March 12, 2001

7:30 AM – 7:45 AM Louise Moore, Director, Research Administration, Office of Research, to pick up Reviewers at Villa Rosa Inn Lobby

7:45 AM – 8:30 AM France A. Córdova, Vice Chancellor for Research - North Hall 2206
with Louise Moore and Nancy Doner

8:30 AM – 9:30 AM Ed Donnerstein, Dean of Social Sciences – North Hall 2206

Everett Zimmerman, Provost, College of Letters & Science (8:30-9:00 AM, only)

9:00 AM – 9:30 AM Dean Donnerstein will be joined at 9:00 am by:
Martin Moskovits, Dean of Mathematical, Life and Physical Sciences,
College of Letters and Science

Robert Rinker, Associate Dean, College of Engineering

9:30 AM – 10:30 AM Richard Appelbaum, Director, ISBER – North Hall 2206

10:30 AM – 11:00 AM Other ORU Directors – North Hall 2206
Claudine Michel, Center for Black Studies
Carl Gutierrez-Jones, Center for Chicano Studies
Catherine Gautier, Institute for Computational Earth System Science

11:00 AM- 11:30 AM Executive Session for Committee

11:30 AM – 12:00 PM ISBER Advisory Committee – North Hall 2208
Susan Stonich, Chair, Anthropology/Environmental Studies
Richard Appelbaum, Director
Steven Chaffee, Communication
Keith Clarke, Geography
Stephen DeCanio, Economics
Carl Gutierrez-Jones, Center for Chicano Studies/English
Barbara Harthorn, ISBER
Kent Jennings, Political Science
Claudine Michel, Center for Black Studies
John Mohr, Sociology

Tim Schmidt, ISBER
Juliet Williams, Law & Society/Women's Studies
Ronald Williams, ISBER

12:00 PM – 1:00 PM **Lunch with Advisory Committee - North Hall 2206/2208**
1:00 PM – 2:00 PM **Barbara Herr Harthorn, Research Development – North Hall 2216**

2:00PM – 2:30PM **Ron Williams, Automated Vital Statistics Software – North Hall 2206**

2:30 PM – 3:00 PM **Dale Kunkel, Center for Communication and Social Policy – North Hall 2206**

3:00 PM – 3:30 PM **Dan Linz/Paolo Gardinali, Benton Survey Research Center – North Hall 2206**

3:30 PM – 4:00 PM **Michael Goodchild, Director, Center for Spatially Integrated Social Science – North Hall 2206**

4:00 PM – 4:30 PM **Aaron Belkin, Director, Center for the Study of Sexual Minorities in the Military – North Hall 2206**

4:30 PM – 6:00 PM **Reception – North Hall 2208 & 2212**

6: 30 PM **Review Committee Dinner at Emilios**

Tuesday, March 13, 2001

8:00 AM **Nancy Doner, Review Coordinator, to pick up Reviewers in Villa Rosa Inn lobby**

8:45 AM- 9:00 AM **Tim Schmidt, MSO ISBER, North Hall 2206**

9:00 AM – 9:45 AM **Social Science Chairs: North Hall 2208**
Anthropology – Francesca Bray
Asian American Studies - Jon Cruz
Economics – Robert Deacon
Chicano Studies – Francisco Lomeli
Political Science – Lorraine McDonnell
Sociology – Beth Schneider
Law & Society – John Sutton

9:45 AM – 10:00 AM **ISBER Administrative Staff – North Hall 2206**

10:00AM – 10:30 AM **Anabel Ford – MesoAmerican Research Center – North Hall 2206**

10:30 AM – 11:00 AM **John DuBois – Center for the Study of Discourse – North Hall 2206**

11:00 AM – 11:45 AM **Andrew Flanagin, Center for Information Technology and Society – North Hall 2206**
Jack Loomis – Navigating without Vision – North Hall 2206

11:45 AM – 12:15PM **Graduate Students – North Hall 2208**

12:15 PM – 1:15 PM

Working Lunch – North Hall 2206

2:00 PM – 3:15 PM

Working time for committee – North Hall 2206

3:15 PM – 3:45 PM

Final Meeting with Director Appelbaum

4:00 PM – 5:00 PM

Exit Interviews. The start time for these meetings is flexible depending on panel needs. Dr. Cordóva's Office, 3227 Cheadle Hall

Ilene Nagel, Executive Vice Chancellor

France A. Cordova, Vice Chancellor for Research